

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-10 are pending, in which claims 1, 4, and 7 are currently amended. The specification is currently amended by presenting a marked up copy of paragraphs to be amended. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

The Office Action mailed September 12, 2003 required corrections to the specification, and rejected claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Norcott* (U.S. 5,848,405), and claims 5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Norcott* in view of *Goldring* (U.S. 6,438,538).

The specification has been amended as required, along with corrections of minor typographical errors. No new matter is added by this amendment to the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 6 over *Norcott* is respectfully traversed because *Norcott* does not disclose the features of the claims. For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites “storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object other than the source object.”

The Office Action contends that *Norcott* discloses

extracting change data from a recovery log (new data for refresh processing purposes, the server process deletes [extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table. Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the **range table** ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 6, lines 29-31 and col. 5, lines 59-61, *Norcott*); and

storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object (the start and end ROWID values are database objects and stored in step 406, see col. 5, lines 58-66, Fig. 4, *Norcott*), said change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object (updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the **range table**, see col. 5, lines 59-60, *Norcott*).

(Office Action, p. 3:4-13, emphasis added, brackets original)

As best understood, the Office Action reads both the recited “source object” and the recited “database object” on the range table of *Norcott*, since the referenced step 406 of *Norcott*

stores the range data in the range table. However, claim 1 recites “storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object **other than the source object.**”

The rejection of dependent claims 2-4 and 6, all of which depend from claim 1, should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with regard to independent claim 1, and these claims are separately patentable on their own merits.

The rejection of claims 5 and 7-10 as obvious over *Norcott* in view of *Goldring* is also respectfully traversed because one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references. Claims 5 and 7-10 recite “**shipping a recovery log** from an on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system to a staging system.”

Goldring, however, teaches away from this feature, as *Goldring* states, “In the network environment the application table 300 is located on the **same system site**, preferably a source site, with a Change Data (CD) table 302 and a Unit of Work (UOW) table 304” (col. 9:22-25, emphasis added). Additionally, *Goldring* states, “Thus, the Apply routine is used to direct the target server to receive an aggregation of the changed rows, received from the CD table 302 and the UOW table 304...” (col. 10:5-7). Thus, *Goldring* requires the CD table 302 to be on the “same system site” as the application table 300, thereby teaching against “shipping the recovery log ... to a staging system.” Furthermore, claims 7-8 recite steps performed on the recovery log “at the staging system.”

Dependent claims 9-10, which depend from claims 7-8, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims, and are separately patentable on its own merits.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the

undersigned attorney at 703-425-8516 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

December 12, 2003

Date

Margo Livesay

Margo Livesay, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 41946

Stephen C. Carlson
Reg. No. 39929

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

10507 Braddock Rd
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8516
Fax. 703-425-8518